

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are now pending in the application.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yu (U.S. Pat. No. 6,161,899, hereinafter "Yu"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-6, 9-10, 15-16 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu (U.S. Pat. No. 6,161,899) in view of Niimi et al. (U.S. 2003/0127898). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu (U.S. Pat. No. 6,161,899) in view of Sugimoto et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,568,756). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the recliner arm includes a "seat flange having at least one mounting aperture therethrough, said mounting aperture adapted for non-rotatably coupling said seat flange to a seat back." Claim 11 has been amended to state that the recliner arm is "non-rotatably attached to said seat back." In Yu, element 102, referred to as a "recliner arm" by the Examiner, does not include any aperture for non-rotatably coupling the recliner arm to a seat back as claimed in claim 1. Further, the recliner arm of Yu does not disclose having a seat back non-rotatably coupled thereto as claimed in claim 11. The recliner arm in Yu is actually a cam. Having a non-rotatable attachment between the cam and the seat back in Yu would actually

render the cam inoperable as intended. As such, Applicants believe that amended claims 1 and 11 distinguish the present teachings from Yu.

Applicant further notes that claims 2-10 and 12-22 depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-22.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 28, 2005

By: 
Michael Malinzak, Reg. No. 43,770

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MAM/JMP